1950-51

File No. A LS 1051

P.W. **DEPARTMENT**

F Br. **BRANCH**

B CLASS

Subject:— Allowances.

Grant of – to Subordinates employed on the Minor Irrign. Works

(52)

V

B [K] 1953

Ltd. Scott. Slip. 24 A.

Std. Sectt. 78A.

G. R., G. D., No. 2408, dated 22-5-22.]

Correspondence

DOCKET SHEET (B)

Subject :—

File No. _____

_____ DEPT.

_____ _____ BRANCH.

References :—

seperated from the main file B[13].

Date.	To whom sent.	Notes and instructions.

Office of the P.S., P.W.D.

As per previously drafted programme of our joint tour in Kanara and Dharwar Dists., myself and Sjt. S.R. Kanthi Parliamentary Secy. for H.M.Agri. & Forests Deptt., toured both the distts., in connection with the execution of the minor irrigation works in those distts. We jointly toured in Haliyal, Yellapur, Sirsi & Mundgod talukas of Kanara Dist. and Hubli, Hangal, Hirekerur, Haveri, Shiggaon and Dharwar Talukas of Dharwar Dist. We were required to tour these areas of the two distts. with the object of expediting the execution of M.I.Works and also to help raise contributions from the local people or receive assurances.

Our tour was a successful one in this sense that during the week or two commencing from the date of our intimation of our tour programme and ending with the finishing of the programme more than fifty agencies were fixed for works in Dharwar and Kanara Distts. Our tour made the contact of the officials with the people or likely contractors or other agencies possible. The Minor Irrigation staff was enthused to work harder and got confidence in their being able to fix up agencies for all works which contributions received or assured.

It was true that in some parts of Kanara Dist. the paucity of labour was felt. But our going there and talks with some leading persons brought about confidence among the officials to say that agencies could be fixed for almost all works early. Some outside labour which is still there round about could be secured for the works. In respect of works ready for execution in up-ghat areas of North Kanara Dist. I had called a meeting of the representatives of the Cooperative Labour Societies spread over below-ghat talukas, to discuss whether any works could be entrusted to them. Three or four societies came forward to undertake the execution. A few private

contractors...

contractors of these areas were also requested by us to undertake the execution of some works. The combined result of our tour and also the strainuous efforts made by the local staff could be seen from the remarks in the 'Remarks column' of the statements affixed hereto.

In Dharwar Dist. there was not much difficulty with regard to the availability of labour. The agriculturists themselves were found to be eager to undertake the work. Even othewise also, contractors are available at short notice.

The presence of S.E.Sjt.A.G.Naik in the course of our tour was largely responsible for the speedy progress in respect of the fixing up of agencies and helping raising contributions. The Ex.Engr. Sjt.Dehuskar has become very popular in his division by his courteous and helpful behaviour with his staff and the local people. His subordinates also were found to have possessed the same qualities he possessed, with the result the progress up to now achieved or the prospects of future progress appear to be more than satisfactory. It is the considered opinion everywhere that frequent transfers should not be made, in as much as the Special one crore loan M.I.Programme lasts upto the end of March 1952 only. I personally think that at least upto the end of March 1952 the staff now posted in the various sub-divisions should not be transferred in the interest of success of the programme of the M.Irrigation, in the Maland areas.

We met the D.L.B.President, Dharwar and asked him whether he could take up some works. He agreed to take up works at Hirekerur side on one condition that we myself and Sjt. Kanthi undertake to pursuade Govt. either to give 15 p.c. supervision charges, as was done in the case of wells or school buildings, or the whole cost of the staff engaged on the M.I.Works was borne by Govt. This point needs to be examined early, since we realised that with their small estabt. and limited scope of activities, it may not be possible for the D.L.B. to undertake works at 10 P.C. without incurring loss.

In.....

In the meanwhile the works will be given to the D.L.B. for execution. In Kanara the D.L.B. is not able to take up works, though willing, in view of their having no sufficient qualified staff. They have at present no Engr. with his post lying vacant for several months. They have therefore applied to Govt. to lend them a Govt. Engr.

From the various columns of statements prepared by us on the basis of the information locally gathered by us during our tour, it will appear that in Kanara the total number of works irrigating more than 30 acres is 454 and in Dharwar 784, out of which the number of works for which contributions received or promised is 181 in Kanara and 409 in Dharwar. With the rapid receipt of contributions or promises from the people, it is natural that the responsibility of staff in respect of preparing early the plans and estimates for all those tanks should multiply. The latest concession of 20 acres limit of Kanara and grouping of tanks within 2-3 miles area will further add to the responsibilities of the staff. With the small number of overseers the work of preparing plans and estimates has not progressed fast. I have been informed that several posts of overseers are created but the response from the qualified people is said to be scanty. The main reason is said to be the difficult nature of work of Minor Irrigation. The situation of tanks in places not easily accessible is the cause of inconvenience. It is proposed that say, about 10 or 15 p.c. of their pay may be given to those as special allowance. Some such thing needs to be done early so that the Malanad may reap the full advantage of the minor irrigation programme.

After all possible concessions were given, it is now realised that question of local contributions does not present any difficulties. The limitation of the staff or any other difficulties pertaining to the carrying out of the survey etc. may act as a check in the achievement of the fullest advantage of the M.I.Programme, with the result the complete execution of all the works for which contributions are promised or received may not be an accomplished fact

by the end of March 1952. While making this remark I presume that there will be no labour difficulty. I am drawing the attention to this aspect only with the object of obviating any possibility of not achieving the fullest measure of progress by the end of March 1952.

In Haliyal, Yellapur and other upghat areas there was felt difficulty with regard to masonary work being got done. Masons and carpenters are not available in these areas and moreover they have been fully engaged in the construction of buildings. I have however requested the cooperative Labour Societies and also requested the Sarvodaya people to help us. It is proposed to use a truck carrying men and materials towards the tanks and get the work done. This proposal also has its limitations in as much as the truck to the tanks may not be suitable at many places. Anyhow this experiment deserves a trial and if successful trucks for the purpose may have to be made available.

One man's tank:- At Yellapur, Mundgod and, in below-ghat areas of North Kanara Dist. and Hangal of Dharwar Dist., the question of one man's tank was raised. People were not found to be satisfied with the policy laid down in that respect. They pointed out that the term 'one man's tank' was misnomer in this sense that its position is not identical with that of Inamdar tank, neither does it irrigate land belonging to one person only. They further pointed out that these tanks do not irrigate larger acreage and that the benefits derived by the landlords or tenants of the area under command or the relations existing between the landlords and tenants in the case of one man's tanks and other second class irrigation tanks did not differ at all. This question, I was informed, was also raised in the M.I.Committee of Dharwar and recommended for suitable modification.

On casual inquiry I learnt that there was some historical basis for such discrimination. The basis is the observation that these tanks did not require repairs at all for a number of years, since they were better looked after and whatever minor repairs necy. were made by the persons in whose name

it.....

it stood. Except for the above difference there seems nothing else justifying the discrimination being made. matter of fact in the case of other second class irrigation tanks, we might come across landowners having far larger areas belonging to one person than in the case of one man's tanks and who do not get a larger share of the crops than in the case of other tanks, nor do the interests of the tenants differ. Under the circumstances it appears inconsistent that such discrimination in the light of what I have indicated above should exist. There are large number of such tanks, particualrly in Kanara Dist., where to expect ½ of the cost of repairs from the landowners would mean a great hardship, having special regard to the conditions of the landowners and the benefits they would derive.

Bigger works it was understood costing about a lac of rupees or so could be taken up under this M.I.Programme without any contibutions from the local people. It was further understood that water rates could be charged on the lands benefitted by the schemes. I do not know how many such proposals have been received or have been found to be possible all over the State. I think there ought to be fair scope for constructing such works in the Malanad areas. If it is possible to call for any such report it may be done so. In this connection the proposal of Heggeri tank with a feeder from which, to the Hommardi tank which was estimated to cost Rs. 1,34,000/- seems to have been submitted to Govt. It would be better if we could take up some such schemes.

Tanks irrigating larger acreage than shown in the tank list:- What should be the policy in respect of such tanks is the question. I have come across many such cases where after actual investigation it was found larger acreage could be served. The difficulty is whether the assessment could be levied on the fresh land found to be under command or whether water rates could be charged to such lands etc. This is not a big problem, but I am mentioning only to draw the attention of Government.

In.....

In belowghat talukas of North Kanara Dist. there are only a few works, the total number (vide third statement prepared by the Ex.Engr.,Kanara) of works being only 124 (60 tanks and 64 bandharas). The contributions are being received and plans and estimates are being got prepared. I have expedited the local P.W.D. and revenue officials to do their respective parts early. I think one or two more overseers may be required there for the Kanara sub-division.

Many bandhara schemes are possible here. But the difficulty is of cost. In many cases cost may go beyond Rs. 150/- in which case we may consider whether such works could be taken up if the amount of increase above Rs. 150/- could be received from the local people. This proposal may not be attractive because all the cultivable land is already put under second crop with katcha bandharas and hence no special benefit will accrue to the agriculturists. Secondly the minimum limit being fifty acres practically no bandhara scheme could be taken up. Hence it may be considered whether the limit may be reduced to 20 acres and above. This needs to be early examined.

These are the few things I wanted to convey to H.M., P.W.D. All the points may be examined and whatever action possible may be taken.

Id. R. N. Prabhu,
15/2
Par.Secy.

H.M.,P.W.D.

For remarks

in particular re: statements at A to E.

Id. J.N.M(ehta),
20/2/51.
H.M.,P.W.D.

The Parliamentary Secy. in his tour note has raised the following points:-

(i) The S.E., K.I.C., Shri Naik, and the Ex.Engr., Dharwar Irrign.Dn., and also their staff should not be transferred till the completion of Spl. programme.

(ii) The D.L.B:,Dharwar, may be given 15% as agency charges instead of 10%.

(iii) Several posts of overseers have been created but Govt. is not getting qualified staff. Reasons for this is the difficult nature of minor irrign. works. As such they may be given 10 or 15% of their pay as spl.allowance.

(iv) A truck may be placed at the disposal of the Ex. Engr. to carry labour and material at the site of the work.

(v) In the case of one Main Tank, the contribution may be ¼th the cost as in other cases instead of ½ the cost.

(vi) The work of constructing Haggeri Tank with feeder to Hammardi tank may be taken up without popular contribution.

(vii) Whether assessment should be levied on addnl. land that will be brought under irrign.

(viii) One or two Overseers may be appointed in Kanara sub-dn.

(ix) The limit of 50 acres in case of new bandharas may be reduced to 20 acres.

2. The following remarks are offered on the various points raised by the Parl.Secy.:-

Point (ii) - The same request was made in the past by the D.L.B., Dharwar and the President was informed in the matter - vide G.L.No.2356/48-I.B.(I), dt. the 21-6-50. It may be further pointed out that in other Dts.(e.g. D.L.B., A'bad) D.L.Bs. have undertaken the works at 10% agency charges. In view thereof it is not understood why D.L.B. Dharwar should be made an exception. In view of this no action is called for on this point.

Point (iv) - The arrangements for taking labour and materials to the site of the works should be made by the contractor or the Agency who undertakes the work. It will not be possible for Govt. to keep such trucks because in one Dt. many works at different places will be in progress and one truck cannot be made available for all works.

Poin

Point (v) - If the One man's tnk irrigates the lands of more than one individual than all these who are benefitted should pay the contribution equal to ½ cost. Previously this share was kept full vide G.C.M.No.2356/48-II dt. the 26-5-50 but after reconsideration it was reduced to ½ the cost vide G.C.M.No.2356/48-II dt. the 13-12-50.It is not perhaps necy. to reduce it still further to ¼th cost.

Point (vi) - As regards the work of constructing Haggeri tank with feeder to Hommadi attention is invited to the notes recorded in file No.2356/48/2953 and G.L.No.2356/48-I.B.(I), dt. 19-1-51.

Point (vii) - As all the works taken up under this scheme will be declared as 2nd class works the assessment will be levied on such works. Also the addnl. area that will be brought into irrign. due to repairs will be charged with assessment.

Point (ix) - The question of reducing the limit of acreage in case of new bandharas has been raised by the A.& F.D. It is separately under consideration and the papers are under submission to the H.M.,P.W.D.

Id. V.B.M.
28/2/51.

Thro' E.B.(I) & (II).

E.B.(I).

Point (i) - As far as the office can seen the present S.E.,Kar.Irrign.Circle.(Shri A.G.Naik), the present Ex.Engr., Dharwar Irrign.Dn. (Shri V.R.Deuskar) and the Dy.Engrs. in that Dn. are not likely to be transferred elsewhere in the near future.

Id. P.R.V.
5/3/51.

E.B.(II)

Point (i) - As regards the non-gazetted staff in the Dn., their transfer in within the competence of the S.E. at his discretion in the exisgencies of the situation. No orders seems to be called for on the suggestion of

the.....

the P.S. except forwarding relevant extract of his note to the S.E., S.C. and the S.E.,K.I.C., for their information.

Point (iii) - At 'B' of his note at page 14 ante, the P.S.has recommended the grant of a special allowance at 10 or 15% of their pay to the Overseers employed on M.I.Works in the Malnad Areas. In the circumstances explained by him, perhaps, the allowance sanctioned in G.R.No.482/48, dt. the 15-4-1950, to the overseers employed on certain project works may be made applicable to the overseers employed on the M.I.Works in the Malnad areas also in u.o. consultation with the F.D.

Point (viii) - The P.S. has recommended one or two addl. overseers for the Kanara sub-Dn. ('Y' of his note at p. 17 ante). If approved definite proposals in the matter, supported by adequate justification, may be called for from the Ex.Engr., in the first inst.

Yes.
K.V.J.
19/3/51.

If the above proposals are approved necy. further action will be taken separately after keeping relevant copies of these notes.

Id. G.K.S.
17/3/51.

Vide pleased margins on pp. 19 to 21 ~~Point (iii)~~

Point (iii) That the staff engaged on M.I.Works may be granted a special allce. of 10 to 15% of the pay on account of the difficult nature of these works.

It is true that as compared to the ordinary roads and Buildings charges the charge of M.I.Works involves lot of inconvenience and also hard and strenuous work, in out of very places to the members of the staff engaged on such works. But this duty cannot be considered as onerous and troublesome as in the case of the staff engaged for days together on survey work or on large construction works - in their initial stage. It will not therefore be possible to accept this proposal. The staff engaged on M.I.Works can however be given relief by laying do that they should be transferred to Roads and Buildings charg after they have served for 5 years on such works. The staff of roads and buildings charge must as a rule compulsarily serve in the charges of M.Irrigation Works for a period

of 5 years.

Id. K.V.J(oglekar)
19/3/51
Dy.Secy.

I toured this Malenad area rec ntly and have gained some first hand knowledge of the M.I. Works carried out there the various points raised by the P.S.were discussed by the S.E.,K.I.C. with me and my views on them are as follows:

(i) Transfer of the existing staff:-

No transfer of the upper staff ~~are~~ contemplated at present.

(ii) Commission charges to the D.L.B.:- No justification to raise it to 15% from 10% - Dharwar D.L.B. does not seem to be very competent. Nothing much can be expected of them and raising the agency ~~charges~~ charges is not going to make any difference.

(iii) Allowance to Overseers engaged on M.I.Works:-

M.I.Works are in out of the way places and touring is difficult, and the subordinates do have to do hard work.

I recommend that 10% of pay may be paid as ~~hard counting~~ minor irrigation allowance to all subordinates in all Circles, who are employed purely on M.I.Works.

A

(iv) Truck for carrying labour:-

The matter may be left to the S.E.

(v) One Man's Tank:-

Original one man's tanks are no longer one man, as there are 3 or 4 khatedars due to partitions.

Whereever the revenue authorities certify that there are more than 1 khatedar on any tank, thourh it is recorded as one man tank. The contribution should be 1/4 as in the case of other tanks.

(vi) Haggari Tank:- I have no knowledge of this.

(vii) Assessment:- I agree with the O.N. But I feel that the assessments should be raised all round - to.....

to about 3 times the old ra tes as prices have risen more than 3 times all round.

(viii) Two additional overseers for ~~Hannadiv:-~~ Kanara Dist.

Let the S.E.put up proposals if necy.

(ix) Limit of 50 acres on bandhara:-

Bandharas are costly structurs and not worth taking up if the area is less than 50 acres.

I do not recommend reduction of this limit to 20 acres.

Id. M.L.C(hamphekar),
25/3/51
Ch.Engr

Id. G.V.B(edekar),
29/3/51
Secy

I agree with the C.Engr. on many points on which he has expressed his opinion after seeing things himself In the case of Bhandharas, it may be true that the cost ~~of~~ would be more than the accepted limit. But my point was only this that whereever cost would be not more than the accepted limit, the limit of ~~ex~~ area should not come in the way. Therefore I had suggested grouping of Bandharas in an area of 2-3 miles. I do not know whether the Ch.Engr. could have a talk with the E.E.Kanara. If so, then I have nothing more to add.

Orders to this effect have been shortly issued, I believe.
Sd. J.N.M(ehta)
3/4/51
H.M.,P.W.D.

With regard to bigger works - namely the two projects suggested by the E.E.D.I.~~C~~ Dharwar, I have to say as follows:- The cost is no doubt more so far the special m.i.programme is concerned. But I think the cost of tanks selected under this category elsewhere may not be less than Rs. 500/-. In which case, if my supposition is correct, the proposals could be ~~sympathically~~ sympathetically considered. A list of such tanks indicating comparitive cost size etc. may please be supplied to me for my imformation.

It is not only the heavy cost of the work that was taken into consideration in disallowing work on Haggeri tank and the feeder but because 333 acres were bagayat land and only 247 acres for rice cultivation Under Rs.1 crore scheme M.I. works for food grains. This may be done. Id.J.N.M.

Id. R.N.P.
2/4/51.
P.S.

To see marginals above.. So far as one tank works.....

are to be carried out and not to be used for garden land.

ALS 1051

works are concerned. I remember S.E.,K.I.C. telling me that he cannot manage works more than what he has on hand. It would be therefore to advisable agree at present to the concession asked for. Anyhow this question might be studied, so that we may know what additional works would be possible if a further loan of Rs. 1 crore be available from the G.of India.

The point raised at A p.(24) ante by C.E. is an important one. It may be further noted on as to cost involved etc. before approaching F.D.

Id. J.N.M(ehta),
3/4/51.
H.M.

I.B.(I). P.W.D.

Resubmitted.

2. A list of 26 big works taken up without popular contribution under the Spl.programme of minor irrign. works has been handed over to the P.Secy. to the H.M.,P.W.D.

3. As reg: the H.M.'s marginal note at p.26 ante sidelinked 'B' necy. orders have already been issued. A copy of G.C.M. has also been handed over to P.S.

Id.V.B.M.
4/4/51.

Thro' E.B.(II).

VMW.
10/4/51.
BB 14/4/51

F.Br.

Resubmitted with reice. to the orders within on points (i), (iii) and (viii)

2. Point (i) Regarding the transfer of the S.E.,K.I.C., and the Ex. Engr. Dhawar Irrg. Dn:- Relevant extract from the P.S's note may be forwarded to the S.E.,S.C., and the S.E.,K.I.C.,

vide my Comments on p 15

P.W.D.
F

The late Parliamentary Secretary, Shri R.N.Prabhu, had a joint tour in Kanara and Dharwar Districts with Shri S.R.Kanthi, then Parliamentary Secretary to the H.M.I. Agriculture & Forests, in connection with the execution of Minor Irrigation works in those Districts. Shri Prabhu had submitted a detailed note in connection with this tour and one of the points raised in that connection was grant of allowance to overseers engaged on Minor Irrigation works. In G.L. No. ALS 1051 F, dated 4-5-51, the S.Es. of Circles were informed that the question of sanctioning an amount equal to 10% of pay as Minor Irrigation Allowance to all subordinates in all Circles who were employed purely on Minor Irrigation works was under the consideration of Govt. and they were asked to report the annual cost in that connection. From the reports received from the local officers, it was evident that the annual recurring cost in the grant of Minor Irrigation Allowance was about Rs.40,100. The F.D. was approached in the matter with a recommendation to agree to the proposal for granting Minor Irrigation Allowance to overseers and other subordinates employed purely on Minor Irrigation works. That Deptt., however, raised the following points before the question could be considered further:-

(i) The number of posts in different categories to whom the allowance was proposed to be granted.

(ii) Whether any of the posts had remained vacant

vacant for want of suitable persons. If so, the number of such posts ~~and the duration~~ and the duration thereof was required to be stated.

(iii) Whether all possibilities of filling in vacant posts required for Minor Irrigation works had been explored without Govt. ~~having~~ being required to assume additional financial liabilities in the form of grant of allowance as contemplated in G.L. No. ALS 1051 F, dated 4-5-51.

2. The local officers were addressed in G.L. No. ALS 1051 F, dated 27-10-51 in regard to the information required by the F.D. Reports from these officers have been received and these are dealt with seriatim in the following paras.

3. The statement below gives the number of posts in different categories to which the allowance is proposed to be extended and the annual extra cost involved on that account. It will be seen from the statement that the total annual extra cost involved in the proposal comes to about Rs.17,000/-.

Sr. No.	Category of posts.	Number of Posts. B.C.	G.I.C.	S.C.	K.I.C.	N.G.C.	S.G.C.	Total
1	Dy. Engr.	2	1	1	-	-	-	4
2	Overseers.	6	11	17	36	10	7	87
3	Surveyors.	6	1	4	15	-	4	33
4	Sub-Overseers.	-	7	3	9	5	6	30
5	Maistries	-	-	-	16	-	2	18
6	Clerks.	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
7	Karkuns.	-	-	-	44	7	6	57
	Peons.	3	-	-	-	-	-	3
	[illegible]lasis	6	-	-	-	-	4	10
	[illegible]s.	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
								Tot[illegible]

ALS 1051/49707

Total:	23	23	25	120	23	30	244
Total annual cost.	3430	2976	4900	16,000 Not stated.	2900	2700	32,906 ~~16806~~

4. The local officers have reported that none of the posts have fallen vacant for want of suitable persons. It is clear from the above that the necessity for grant of such an allowance was not as keen as it was expected.

5. The local officers have unanimously agreed that there was no difficulty in getting suitable hands for Minor Irrigation works. The S.E.,B.C., P-33-C has stated that it could not be stated that some of the existing incumbents would resign the jobs on account of the special difficulties and hardships with which they have to put up on their appointment on Minor Irrigation works. The S.Es., S.C. and S.G.C. have PP-47-48 — D 67-68 C stated that no posts have been vacant for want of suitable persons. The S.E.,D.I.C., also does not consider it necessary to grant Minor Irrigation Allowance because he considers that the duties of Minor Irrigation works are not so strenuous and arduous as to justify grant of such an allowance,

6. From the remarks made above it will be seen that the need for grant of Minor Irrigation Allowance is not so pressing as it was first thought and in view of the annual recurring cost involved in the proposal ~~posal~~

posal, it will have to be put up as a new item for consideration of Govt. It is for consideration whether the proposal need be proceeded with further or whether the matter may be dropped and the papers recorded.

BVK.
31.5.52.

2.6.52

The proposal may not be pursued further

Dy Secy

Secy

ALS:1051/4944

E.B2.

D.W.D.

one question of granting minor foreign allowance to subordinates employed in M.S. works has been dropped one S.E., S.E.G. may be informed accordingly with ref. to para. 2 of his endt., dated the 12-1-53 P.69 C/S P.71 C/S one draft put up for approval may issue

A.S.(I)

~~15~~ 1

Parliamentary

Below extract from the ~~Par~~. Secy's note, dt. the 15-2-51, reg. his tour in Kanara and Dharwar Dists: in connection with the execution of the M.I.W. in those Dists.

No. ALS 1051-~~F~~.

P. W. D.
B.C.(B'bay No.1),
4th May 1951.

Forwarded to the S.E.,S.C., and the S.E.,K.I.C., for information.

By order etc.

S.A.S.

21/5/51

~~15~~ 1

Parliamentary

Below extract from the ~~Par~~. Secy's note, dt. the 15-2-51, reg. his tour in Kanara and Dharwar Dists. in connection with the execution of the M.I.W. in those Dists.

No. ALS 1051-P.

P. W. D.
B.C.(B'bay No.1),
4th May 1951.

Forwarded to the S.E.,S.C., and the S.E.,K.I.C., for information.

By order etc.

S.A.S.

21/5/51

2 16

Letter.

No.ALS 1051-E. -P. W. D.
B.C.(B'bay No.1),
4th May 1951.

To

The S.Es of Circles.

Subject:- Minor Irrg. allnce. to all subordinates employed purely on M.I. works.

The question of sanctioning 10% of pay as Minor Irrign. Allnce. to all subordinates in all circles who are employed purely on M.I. works is under the consideration of Govt. Please report, at an early date, the annual cost that will be involved, so far as your circle is concerned, if the allnce. is sanctioned.

By order etc.,

D.A. Nil.

S. A. S.

MDH/-
2.5.51.

ALS 1051/2329

52

Overseers	...	3	(Temporary)
Surveyors	...	5	(work-charged)
Suboverseers	...	6	(4 templ & 2 work-charged)

Out of the remaining categories, the following no.of posts are vacant from the month shown against them:

Maistries	...	8 Nos.(vacant from July 1951)
Karkuns	...	5 Nos. (-do- March 1951)

3. In the case of these vacant posts, Government will not be required to assume additional financial liabilities and the vacant posts will be filled in shortly as the working season has now started and the works will be full swing.

Manager
P.W.D.

Superintending Engineer, K.I.C.

BR/7-1.

ALS 1051
2329

No. G-5

Office of the Superintending Engineer,
Karnatak Irrigation Circle,
Dharwar, 4 Jany.1952.

To

The Chief Engineer to Government,
Public Works Department,
Bombay-1.

Subject:- Grant of allowance to subordinates employed on Minor Irrigation works.

Reference: Government letter, P.W.D.No. ALS-1051-F. dated the 22nd October 1951.

2. The grant of allowance to the following posts is recommended:-

Overseers	...	36 Nos.
Surveyors	...	15 "
Suboverseers	...	9 "
Maistries	...	16 "
Karkuns	...	44 "

Out of the above, the following Nos. of subordinates are proposed to be engaged on Minor Irrigation works upto March 1952 only in Ghataprabha Left Bank Canal Division, which has been entrusted with Minor Irrigation works in Gokak Taluka:-

Overseers...

No.G.R.-69.

Public Works Department
Belgaum: 5th January 1952.

From:

The Superintending Engineer,
Southern Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer,
Public Works Department, Bombay No.1.

SUBJECT: Grant of allowance to subordinates employed on Minor Irrigation Works.

REFERENCE: Government immediate letter No.ALS 1051 F. dated the 31st December 1951.

2/- Information called for in Government letter (P.W.D.) No.ALS 1051 F dated 22nd October 1951 has been submitted under this office letter No.GR-69 dated 18th December 1951.

D.A.Nil.

Superintending Engineer,S.C.

VGP/5-1.

...

F 9/1

AL 9105

2097

For disposal pl. see S. No. 2329

and there is no question of exploring the possibilities of filling in the vacant posts.

3. The annual cost may please be taken as Rs.4900/- instead of Rs. 5000/- reported in my letter No.GR-69, dated 30-5-1951.

D.A.:- NIL.

Superintending Engineer, S.C.

GDT/-18.12,(

F.Br.

P.&D.

Await

11-1-52.

Supdt.

F

Letter.

From

The Superintending Engineer,
Southern Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer,
Public Works Department, BOMBAY 1.

No.GR-69.

Public Works Department,
Belgaum: 18th December 1951.

SUBJECT: Grant of allowance to subordinates employed on Minor Irrigation Works.

REFERENCE: Govt. Letters, P.W.D. No.ALS-1051-F dated the 22nd October 1951 & 26th November 1951.

2. Information regarding the number of posts in different categories to whom the allowance is proposed to be granted is given below :-

1) Deputy Engineers	...	1
2) Overseers	...	17
3) Surveyors	...	4
4) Suboverseers	...	3

No posts have remained vacant for want of suitable persons

and ...

3. As for the Ghataprabha Left Bank Canal Division the construction of bandharas is taken up in hand and the annual cost on that account would be Rs.1764/-for the year 1951-52 only."

Superintending Engineer, K. I. C.

BR/27-5.

F. Bv.

Await. p.2

Suppl.

P. W. D.
File No. ALS 1057
Serial No. 46547

29-5-57

11

No. G-5

Office of the Superintending Engineer,
Karnatak Irrigation Circle,
C.V. Dharwar, 27-5-- 1951.

To

The Chief Engineer,
Public Works Department,
Bombay-1.

Subject: Minor Irrigation allowance to all subordinates employed purely on Minor Irrigation works.

Reference: Government letter (P.W.D.) No.ALS 1051 F, dated the 4th May 1951.

2. The two Divisions in this Circle viz. Dharwar Irrigation Division and Ghataprabha Left Bank Canal Division have been entrusted with Minor Irrigation works. The Dharwar Irrigation Division comprises mainly of Minor Irrigation works in the Dharwar District and part of Kanara District, and the annual cost of Minor Irrigation allowance that will be involved would be approximately -

Rs. 10,000/- for outdoor staff
and Rs. 6,000/- for indoor staff.

3. .

5

Letter.

From

The Superintending Engineer,
Southern Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer,
Public Works Department, BOMBAY 1.

No.GR-69.

Public Works Department,
Belgaum: 30th May 1951.

Subject: Minor Irrigation allowance to all subordinates employed purely on Minor Irrigation Works.

Reference: Govt. Letter (P.W.D) No.ALS.1051-F dated the 4th May 1951.

An amount of Rs. 5,000/- approximately will be required annually for the Southern Circle, if Minor irrigation allowance at 10 % of pay, is sanctioned to all subordinates employed purely on Minor Irrigation Works.

GDT/28-5.

Superintending Engineer, S.C.

6

F 1/6

F. W. [redacted]

File No. ALS1051

Serial No. 47685

F

1 6 51

Extract from the Parliamentary Secretary's note, dated the 15th February 1951, regarding his tour in Kanara and Dharwar Districts in connection with the execution of the Minor Irrigation Work in those Districts.

"It is the considered opinion everywhere that frequent transfers should not be made, in as much as the Special one crore loan Minor Irrigation Programme lasts upto the end of March 1952 only. I personally think that at least upto the end of March 1952 the staff now posted in the various sub-divisions should not be transferred in the interest of success of the programme of the Minor Irrigation, in the Malanad areas.

.....

No. ALS 1951 F.

Public Works Department,
Bombay Castle(Bombay No. 1),
4th May 1951.

Forwarded to the Superintending Engineer, Southern Circle, and the Superintending Engineer, Karnatak Irrigation Circle, for information.

By order of the Governor of Bombay,

5/5/51

Assistant Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Public Works Department.

LBW/4/5/51.